arXiv:1606.00424v1 [q-fin.EC] 1 Jun 2016

Price formation on a housing market and spatial income segregation

Marco Pangallo*[,1,2,3,4], Jean-Pierre Nadal[3,5], and Annick Vignes[3,6]

[1]Institute for New Economic Thinking at the Oxford Martin School, University of Oxford, Oxford OX26ED, UK
[2]Mathematical Institute, University of Oxford, Oxford OX13LP, UK
[3]Centre d'Analyse et de Mathématique Sociales, École des Hautes Études en Sciences Sociales, 190-198 Avenue de France, 75013 Paris, France
[4]Dipartimento di Fisica, Università di Torino, Via Pietro Giuria 1, 10125 Turin, Italy
[5]Laboratoire de Physique Statistique, École Normale Supérieure, 24 rue Lhomond, 75231 Paris, France
[6]École des Ponts ParisTech, 6-8 Avenue Blaise Pascal, 77455 Champs-sur-Marne, France

Abstract

The price formation in Non-Walrasian markets is notoriously an open problem. Here we focus on urban housing markets, where the mismatch between supply and demand has important consequences in terms of social welfare. We propose a simple Agent-Based Model (ABM) that explicitly reproduces the market mechanism and which is specifically suited to study issues related to spatial income segregation. We first find the analytical solution of the ABM in some specific cases, shedding light on the structure of the model and on the effect of the parameters. We then simulate the fully-fledged ABM and find that: (i) the market mechanism easily implies income segregation; (ii) an increase of the demand in one part of the city can potentially increase the prices all over the city (in qualitative agreement with the data); (iii) subsidies are more efficient than taxes in mitigating income segregation. These non-trivial results provide an example of the kind of insights that can be gained if one considers bounded rationality, heterogeneity and the potential lack of (Walrasian) equilibrium, as it would have been much less natural to address these issues under more standard assumptions.

Keywords: price formation, housing market, income segregation, spatial economics

*Corresponding author: marco.pangallo@maths.ox.ac.uk. We thank seminar participants at ISCPIF, SCCS 2015 and INET Oxford, in particular Henri Berestycki, David Pugh, Doyne Farmer and Matteo Richiardi, for helpful comments. Most of this work was done during the internship of Marco Pangallo at the CAMS for the preparation of his master thesis in Physics of Complex Systems. MP especially thanks Pietro Terna, who was the main advisor of the thesis, for insightful and frequent discussions. MP acknowledges financial support from the Erasmus Traineeship programme.

1 Introduction

Where people produce and where they live has been for a long time at the centre of hot debates, among different disciplines as geography, economics and sociology. The allocation of people into the most productive areas, mostly the so-called alpha cities, is becoming an issue of central importance in the globalized world. The growing demand is inducing a soar in the real-estate prices, gradually making it impossible for anyone but the richest individuals to settle into the most important cities. Understanding the process of price formation in housing markets with an emphasis on their spatial aspect would make policies dealing with income segregation more effective. Yet, most current models do not explicitly represent price formation or do not consider a spatially explicit framework, and the theoretical understanding of the drivers of income segregation is not complete. This article proposes a stylized Agent-Based Model (ABM) whose goal is to realistically reproduce some features of the housing market and to check whether the market mechanism would imply income segregation. Our model considers a city inhabited by agents with different income and utility depending on a spatial attractiveness. The goods which are put on the market are allocated through a continuous double auction. We are successful in finding an analytical characterization of the steady state of the model in some specific cases. Thanks to the mathematical solution we understand the effect of the parameters and we prove formally that the agents self-organize into a stable state. We obtain a number of expected results in the context of housing markets: a higher demand or a lower supply increase the market price, the stickiness of the prices worsens segregation, an increase in the number of available apartments has a beneficial effect on the level of social mixing. We then simulate the fully-fledged ABM and find some more surprising results. First, if the income distribution is such that the share of rich agents is higher, there is substantially more segregation, but only the offset of the prices changes. Second, an increase of the demand in one part of the city can potentially increase the prices all over the city (which is in qualitative agreement with our data). Third, subsidies are more efficient than taxes in mitigating income segregation.

We attempt at modelling price formation in a Non-Walrasian context (Colander, 2006). Urban economics is probably one of the settings where the assumption of market clearing and mutually consistent preferences is less likely to hold. Note that neoclassical economics has always faced problems in modelling the housing market. In the words of Fujita (1989):

> *The theory of urban land use and city size is an especially appealing topic of study because much of traditional economic theory cannot be readily applied. Although traditional economic theory aptly describes competitive markets typical of most Western societies, it is essentially designed to deal with spaceless problems. Hence, many of the basic assumptions of this theory are no longer appropriate for spatial problems such as land use.*

The theory of land use dates back to Ricardo (1817), who explained the different prices of land by the differences in expected agricultural productivity. Von Thünen (1826) related the organization of the agricultural land use to the distance from the centre. The fundamental assumption of his model was that farmers have to sell their products through a market which is at the centre of the region. To reach this market, people have to pay a transportation cost, which varies with the distance and the type of the products. Keeping the idea of a monocentric city, Alonso (1964) developed a model of household location with a system of land allocation behaving as an implicit bid-auction process and this has been accepted as a relevant way to formulate a consistent theory on land economics. The Alonso model offers a nice characterization of the trade-off between apartment size and distance from the centre, but does not explicitly deal with price formation. Modern models such as Landvoigt et al. (2015) use matching theory, but do not explicitly model price formation either.

On the other hand, the Agent-Based Modelling (ABM) literature explicitly modelled the mechanism of the urban housing market in a decentralized way. Feitosa et al. (2008) propose an ABM which shows how segregation can emerge even if one considers the simplest setting with the minimal number of parameters. The opposite end of the complexity spectrum is taken by Gilbert et al. (2009): they build an ABM where some houses can be constructed,

others are demolished, some agents may put their apartment on sale because they lost their job, etc. Filatova et al. (2009) present an ABM which is pretty much in the spirit of the present paper, but they assume that the reservation offer price is just 25% more of the so-called agricultural rent[1]. Our aim is to represent the supply side in a more realistic way, still keeping the model amenable to analytical treatment. We build on Gauvin et al. (2013), by which our model shares many assumptions but differs substantially on the market aspect. First, we introduce a utility function for the buyers, so that they can also value non-housing consumption. Second, we assume that the sellers consider the market price and the excess supply in determining their reservation offer price, rather than simply writing the reservation price as a smooth function of the demand. Third, we match the buyers and the sellers through a continuous double auction, which we take as a proxy of a bargaining process.

Our ABM is specifically thought to identify the drivers of the price-space differentiation, e.g. to find the relative prices in the centre compared to those in the periphery. Because of that, we consider an inelastic global demand, and we do not deal with credit markets: including these aspects would likely change the average prices, but not the relative ones. We consider heterogeneity both in terms of the space (each location is endowed with a specific value of intrinsic attractiveness) and of the income of the agents. The utility of the buyers looking for an apartment at a certain location depends both on the attractiveness at that location and on a non-housing consumption good, so indirectly on the price of the apartment. Based on the expected utility, the buyers search at a certain location following a boundedly rational rule. The housed agents become sellers at a constant and homogeneous rate and set their reservation offer price looking at the price of the transactions at the previous time step (the *market price*) and the excess supply. We model the price stickiness typical of housing markets by using a parameter that sets the level of excess supply that is needed for the sellers to decrease their reservation price with respect to the market price. Finally, the buyers and the sellers place their reservation prices in an order book, and the transactions take place.

We first find the mathematical solution of the ABM, by taking the continuum and mean-field limits and by considering specific situations. We are able to shed light on the causal mechanisms inside the ABM, we prove that a globally stable steady state exists and we characterize it, thereby understanding the effect of the parameters. From a methodological point of view, we start from the simplest setting (only one category, the buyers only consider the attractiveness in their utility function) and we increase the complexity of the model in a modular way, still being able to find some analytical results. We do not attempt at finding a general solution, which would be infeasible, but we provide insights that are valid also in the most complex settings. We then simulate the ABM with several categories and the tradeoff between non-housing and housing consumption, where the latter is characterized by the attractiveness. The first result is expected, in that a larger share of rich agents within the buyers implies higher prices and consequently a stronger segregation. The second result is less expected: a rise of the demand in one part of the city can potentially increase the prices all over the city. Actually, the interpretation is rather straightforward: an increase in the prices in a relatively rich neighbourhood implies that most of the middle-class agents that would consider living there would rather move to the working-class areas due to a substitution effect with the non-housing consumption good, and so the prices increase also at the less attractive locations. Note that this result is qualitatively in agreement with the data on the Paris housing market. The third result is probably the most surprising one. If a system of taxes and subsidies is implemented, so that the effective price paid by the agents varies, it turns out that taxes alone are counterproductive, while subsidies are much more efficient. This looks counterintuitive at first sight, since the subsidies are known to increase the market price. However, the rise of the price is modest with respect to the increase in purchasing power that the subsidies entail. On the other hand, taxation for the

[1]The agricultural rent is a concept that was introduced by Von Thünen (1826). It defines the boundaries of a monocentric city and it is a rent price below which the land owners would dedicate their terrain to agriculture rather than renting it.

richest agents does decrease the market price, but this only comes at the advantage of the middle-class agents, leaving the poorest agents segregated out of the most attractive areas.

Note that, had we just considered two categories, it would not have been possible to obtain the latter result. By considering full heterogeneity we have been able to address the issue of segregation from a multidimensional point of view. Also, by assuming that the buyers choose a location using a boundedly rational rule we obtained a demand distribution over the locations, rather than having all agents applying to the location where the utility would be maximal. Finally, by renouncing to the Walrasian assumption, we have explicitly modelled price formation and naturally found how the market mechanism shapes income segregation. Therefore, by altogether considering heterogeneity, bounded rationality and potential lack of market clearing we have been able to deal with an issue that would have been more hardly addressed under more standard hypotheses.

The rest of this paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 we present the model; we then give an approximate mathematical description of it in Section 3, while we provide results from the numerical simulations in Section 4. Section 5 concludes.

2 Model

We propose an Agent-Based Model (ABM) for the urban housing market. We consider a city whose locations are characterized by a certain level of attractiveness. The buyers are heterogeneous for what concerns their income and are boundedly rational in deciding a location where to look for an apartment. The sellers look at the past market price and at the excess supply of the apartments in their location and determine their reservation offer price. Buyers and sellers are finally matched through a continuous double auction (CDA).

The city is defined as a two-dimensional square lattice Ω of locations $X \in \mathbb{Z}^2$, with linear size L. The origin O is taken as the geographical centre of the city, and two neighbouring locations are separated by a distance a. All locations are characterized by an intrinsic attractiveness $A(X)$, which we will assume dependent on the distance from the centre (the generalization to other settings, such as polycentric cities, is trivial). The same number N of identical dwellings is available at each location $X \in \Omega$. Time is discrete and indexed by t. At each time step t a constant number Γ of randomly-chosen agents arrive on the market. At the same time, housed agents become sellers at a homogeneous rate α.[2] So the goods available for sale at a given location are those put on the market by these agents plus, if any, those that have not yet been sold. The sellers who succeed in selling their good and the buyers who cannot secure an apartment leave the market (they may come back with a subsequent cohort, it is not important to keep track of the identities of the agents), while successful buyers become housed. The agents are characterized by their wealth Y (henceforth, we will use income and wealth interchangeably, see footnote 4 for an explanation of why they can be used equivalently in this setting). For simplicity, we consider a finite number K of income levels. Agents with the same income are denoted by k-agents, $k \in \{1, ..., K\}$, and have income Y_k. These incomes are ordered by increasing values, $Y_1 < Y_2 < ... < Y_K$ and are separated by a constant Δ. We denote the number of incoming agents in each income category by Γ_k, s.t. $\sum_k \Gamma_k = \Gamma$. Choosing appropriately Δ and $\{\Gamma_k\}$, any realistic income distribution may be modelled.

The k-buyers have utility function $U_k(X,t) = z_k(t)^{1-\beta} \left(A(X)\right)^{\beta}$, where $z_k(t)$ represents the non-housing consumption of k-agents at time t and $\beta \in [0,1]$ is the weight given to the attractiveness. The budget constraint of the buyers at the optimal level (i.e. they fully

[2] It would be reasonable to assume that the global demand Γ and the leave rate α depend on the level of the prices in the city. However, being concerned primarily with income segregation, we are mostly interested in the relative prices (e.g. how the price in the periphery compares to that in the centre), which are influenced more strongly by the attractiveness than by the global demand or leave rate. We leave the endogenization of Γ and α to future work. One interesting result could be the existence of price cycles in the city.

consume their income) is:[3]

$$z_k(t) + P(X,t) = Y_k \tag{1}$$

Here $P(X,t)$ is the market price, defined as the average price of the transactions at location X and time t,[4] and we have assumed unit cost for the non-housing consumption good, which is the numéraire of the economy. Replacing the budget constraint in the utility function, we have:

$$U_k(X,t) = \begin{cases} (Y_k - P(X,t))^{1-\beta} (A(X))^{\beta}, & Y_k > P(X,t) \\ 0, & Y_k \leq P(X,t) \end{cases} \tag{2}$$

We assume a probabilistic model for the choice of residential location by the agents: the k-buyers choose location X at time t with probability $\pi_k(X,t) = U_k(X,t)/\sum_{X' \in \Omega} U_k(X',t)$.[5] So the demand side of the market is characterised by the number of buyers $N_b(X,t)$ and by their reservation demand price, which we assume to be their income: $P_k^d = Y_k$. The supply side is characterized by the number of sellers $N_s(X,t)$ and by their reservation offer price. As a realistic feature of the housing markets, we assume that the sellers first look at the market price[6], which is the average price of the transactions at time $t-1$. However, they also look at the level of excess supply, otherwise unrealistic behaviour could occur.[7] Therefore, we assume that the reservation offer price at time t is determined by the market price at time $t-1$ weighted by a logistic function (so that the price cannot turn negative) whose argument depends on the excess supply. Thus the reservation offer price at location X and time t reads:

$$P^o(X,t) = P(X,t-1) \frac{1}{1 + e^{-\phi(X,t)}} \tag{3}$$

where $\phi(X,t) = \frac{N_b(X,t) - N_s(X,t) - \mu}{\sigma}$. Here σ and μ give respectively the width of the logistic function and the level of the excess supply at which the sellers choose a reservation price which is a half of the market price at the previous time step (if μ were zero or positive, the sellers would halve $P(X,t-1)$ even in the case of market clearing, which would not be reasonable, as they would rather try to sell at least at the market price at $t-1$. So we will typically take negative μ). So μ can be related to the stickiness of the price in that slightly negative or positive values of μ imply that the sellers choose a reservation price

[3] We are not considering credit markets, which may look like an unreasonable assumption given that housing markets are driven by credit. However, for the same reasons as in footnote 2, the presence of credit markets should not change substantially the results. Future versions of the model should allow for borrowing and could be used to study the feedback between the financial fragility of the economy and the housing markets (Geanakoplos et al., 2012), which is not the focus of the present paper.

[4] Since we assume that the market price $P(X,t)$ is paid instantaneously, so that we do not need to consider credit markets (see footnote 3), Y_k is actually the net worth, or wealth, of k-agents. However, we assume that the k-agents, before coming to the market, save part of their income, until their net worth is Y_k. For simplicity, we just consider the Y_ks to be the relevant quantities and we denote them by income.

[5] A standard way to include bounded rationality in choice theory is to use a logit rule (see e.g. Bouchaud (2013), section VI, or Nadal et al. (1998) for a microfoundation based on the tradeoff between exploration and exploitation). However, in order to keep a parsimonious parametrization and because of its smoothness properties, we simply consider the relative utility.

[6] Another reasonable assumption would be that the sellers consider the price they paid when they purchased the apartment and try to avoid a loss. We explored the consequences of this additional assumption in Pangallo (2015) and found that it did not yield further insights compared to Eq. (3), which we chose because of its clearer meaning.

[7] For instance, if at location X there is a unique transaction at an extremely high price at $t-1$ and there is significant excess supply at t, if the sellers were just looking at the market price then their reservation offer price would be extremely high as well, notwithstanding the excess supply. In the most extreme case, that would happen even for $N_b(X,t) = 1$ and $N_s(X,t) = N \gg 1$ and may prevent any transaction to happen if the income of the buyer is not sufficiently high. On the subsequent time steps, the sellers would still be stuck at the market price at $t-1$ and location X would be in a "frozen" state.

that is relatively below the market price, while large and negative values of μ imply perfect convergence to the market price.

Finally, matching between buyers and sellers occurs through a CDA, which we take as a proxy of a bargaining process. The reservation offer (demand) prices[8] enter as asks (bids) in the order book as a random sequence until all agents have placed their (limit) orders, and the lowest ask is continuously matched with the highest bid, if the transaction is possible. This feature of the order book can be seen as a source of randomness that gives the k-agents whose net worth is higher than the reservation offer price but lower than that of the richest K-agents a chance to secure an apartment, ensuring some social diversity as long as $P^o(X,t) < Y_{K-1}$. If the matching rule was such that the richest agents were the first ones to buy an apartment and the number of K-buyers was higher than the apartments on sale, that is $N_{b,K}(X,t) > N_s(X,t)$, no k-agents with $k < K$ but sufficient wealth, $Y_k > P^o(X,t)$, could complete a transaction, implying a disproportionate exacerbation of income segregation.

3 Mathematical analysis

The goal of this section is to show that, in spite of the complexity of the ABM, its most important features can be understood analytically. We are particularly interested in finding the control parameters that matter the most, and if possible to group them in fewer effective parameters. Our strategy is modular, in that we focus on specific aspects of the ABM while neglecting other features in order to maintain tractability.

The following simplifying assumptions are made. First, we average out stochastic effects by taking expected values. Second, we assume continuous space by considering a vanishing distance between the locations, $a \to 0$.[9] All "numbers" become densities, which we denote by a lower-case letter (e.g. the density of buyers is $n_b(r) = N_b(r)/a^2$). Third, we assume spherical symmetry and that the attractiveness decreases with the distance from the centre r, so that we can write $A(r)$, with $A'(r) < 0$. A possible specification of $A(\cdot)$ is:

$$A(r) = \begin{cases} e^{-\frac{r^2}{R^2}}, & 0 < r \leq R_{max} \\ 0, & r > R_{max} \end{cases} \tag{4}$$

where R is a steepness parameter and R_{max} represents the border of the city, chosen in a way that the areas of the discrete-space square lattice and its continuous-space circular approximation are the same, that is $\pi R_{max}^2 = L^2$. In order to emphasize that the results that follow do not depend on the specific form of the attractiveness (4), we will write in general $A(r)$, except when performing specific calculations.

Finally, in Section 3.1 we assume that the agents only value the attractiveness in their utility function (so $\beta = 1$) and we consider only one income category ($K = 1$). In Section 3.2 we relax the former assumption, and we consider the tradeoff between non-housing consumption and attractiveness, while in Section 3.3 we consider two income categories, $K = 2$. In Section 3.4 we discuss the effect of the parameters.

3.1 Baseline case

We can write the law of motion for the market price at distance r from the centre by employing (3) and the definition of the market price, that is the average price of the transactions,

[8] The assumption that the agents directly place their reservation prices in the order book, rather than progressively converging towards the market price, can be justified in an ultimatum game fashion, so that the agents have a strong incentive to conclude the transactions at time t, if that is possible. Considering an adjustment process did not alter the results.

[9] This assumption is necessary to compute integrals, but does not work well in discrete-space simulations, where we will take $a = 1$. However, note that it is equivalent to assume $L \to \infty$. In practice, with $L = 11$ one obtains a pretty good approximation. For instance, using the parameter values in Table 1 and the specification of the attractiveness in Eq. (4) one finds only a 0.4% difference between the discrete and continuous cases.

here at the middle between the reservation and offer prices:

$$P(r,t+1) = \frac{Y + P^o(r,t+1)}{2} = f\left(P(r,t)\right) \tag{5}$$

with $f(\cdot)$ a linear function of its argument. We can easily check that, for any value of $\phi(r,t)$, the dynamical system has a unique stable fixed point[10], which we characterize by the quantities $n_s^\star(r), n_b^\star(r), P^\star(r)$. The density of buyers is fixed by the value of the attractiveness: $n_b^\star(r) = \gamma A(r)/\mathcal{Z}$, with $\mathcal{Z} = \frac{2\pi}{a^2}\int_0^{R_{max}} rA(r)dr$. The density of sellers can be computed by summing the density of apartments already on sale, denoted as $\bar{n}_s(r,t)$, and the fraction of apartments newly put on sale: $n_s(r,t) = \bar{n}_s(r,t) + \alpha\left(n - \bar{n}_s(r,t)\right)$. Since by definition $\bar{n}_s(r,t) = n_s(r,t-1) - n_b(r,t-1)$, one gets for the steady state: $n_s^\star(r) = n - ((1-\alpha)/\alpha)\cdot n_b^\star(r)$. Finally, the stationary value[11] for the market price reads:

$$P^\star(r) = \frac{Y(1+e^{-\phi^\star(r)})}{1+2e^{-\phi^\star(r)}}, \text{ where } \phi^\star(r) = \frac{\frac{\gamma}{\alpha}\frac{A(r)}{\mathcal{Z}} - n - \mu}{\sigma} \tag{6}$$

As it can be seen in Fig. 1a, the analytical results are confirmed by the numerical simulation of the discrete-space and fully heterogeneous dynamics. Eq. (6) shows that the prices are higher for the locations closer to the centre and for higher values of the ratio γ/α, i.e. for a stronger density of incoming agents or a lower density of leaving agents. Moreover, if there is stickiness on the seller's side (i.e. $\mu << 0$), the prices settle at the highest possible level given the budget constraint, that is the income Y. This result can be intuitively understood simply by noticing that if the reservation offer price at time t is the market price at $t-1$, the matching in the order book will imply a higher market price at t, until the highest possible income level is reached.

3.2 General utility

In general, the utility function for k-buyers in choosing a location at distance r from the centre at time t is:

$$U_k(r,t) = z_k(t)^{1-\beta}\left(A(r)\right)^\beta \tag{7}$$

where $0 \leq \beta \leq 1$. Since only the utility function is different, the analysis performed in Section 3.1 is unchanged. In particular, the fixed point $P^\star(r)$ is still stable and has the same functional form as in (6). On the other hand, $\phi^\star(r)$ now reads:

$$\phi^\star(r) = \frac{\frac{\gamma}{\alpha}\frac{(Y-P^\star(r))^{1-\beta}e^{-\beta r^2/R^2}}{\mathcal{Z}^\star} - n - \mu}{\sigma} \tag{8}$$

Here $\mathcal{Z}^\star = 2\pi\int_0^{R_{max}} w\left(Y - P^\star(w)\right)^{1-\beta} e^{-\beta w^2/R^2}dw$. In order to find $P^\star(r)$ we need an iterative solution: We start from an arbitrary value for $\mathcal{Z}^\star$ and solve Eq. (6) (replacing Eq. (8)) numerically for 10000 values $0 < r < R_{max}$, computing $\mathcal{Z}^\star$ with the trapezoidal method. We iterate this procedure until convergence for $\mathcal{Z}^\star$ is reached. As it can be seen in Fig. 1b, for $0 \leq \beta \leq 0.5$ the prices are almost uniform across the city and close to the income value, $P^\star(r) \approx Y$. The reason why this happens is that there is little or almost none excess supply: if the agents face a tradeoff between housing and non-housing consumption, the markets clear more easily due to a substitution effect, and so the prices are uniform but higher.

[10] In order to avoid confusion with the terminology, we disambiguate between Walrasian and dynamical equilibrium.

[11] It would be interesting to consider the transient, as the time scale of relaxation to (dynamical) equilibrium may be relevant. However, in the model and in reality the sellers look at the latest available market price, and do not consider lags of market prices, which would yield a transient dynamics that can be tuned by the weight given to the latest available market price. Therefore, we just focus on the stationary state, but it would be interesting to consider some sources of out-of(dynamical)-equilibrium dynamics.



(a) (b)

Figure 1: Market price as a function of the distance from the centre. The parameter values are as in Table 1, if not otherwise specified. (*Left*) $\beta = 1$, $K = 1$. The analytical prices are from (6), and they are compared with the results from corresponding numerical simulations. The prices are higher in the centre. (*Right*) $\beta \in [0, 1]$, $K = 1$. See the legend for the color code. The prices are higher and more uniform if the agents substitute housing and non-housing consumption.

3.3 Two categories

Now we keep $\beta = 1$ and consider two categories, $K = 2$, characterized by their income levels Y_1 and Y_2, $Y_2 = Y_1 + \Delta$ and denoted respectively as *1-agents* and *2-agents*. We study under which conditions the market mechanism implies income segregation. In particular, we determine if there exists a completely segregated circle with centre O and radius $r_c \in [0, R_{max}]$ such that the stationary value for the market price is higher than the income level of the 1-agents, $P^\star(r) > Y_1$, $\forall r < r_c$. Since the circle is inhabited only by 2-agents, we can use the one category result (6) with $Y = Y_2$ and $\gamma = \gamma_2$. Rearranging the boundary condition $P^\star(r_c) = Y_1$ we get:

$$A(r_c) = \frac{\mathcal{Z}}{\gamma_2/\alpha}\left[n + \mu - \sigma \ln\left(\frac{\Delta/Y_1}{1 - \Delta/Y_1}\right)\right] \tag{9}$$

Further insight can be gained by considering the specific form of the attractiveness as in Eq. (4), that is $A(r) = \exp(-r^2/R^2)$, for $r < R_{max}$: if the RHS in (9) is greater than one, then there is no segregated region; on the contrary, if the RHS is close to zero, the segregated region is the whole city (that is, $r_c \geq R_{max}$; if the RHS is negative this is true *a fortiori*, since $P^\star(r) > Y_1$, $\forall r$). This result is consistent with what can be expected from the value of the parameters: more segregation (r_c farther from the centre) is due to a stronger density of incoming 2-agents γ_2 and to a larger relative difference between income levels. On the contrary, a higher density of available apartments n and the lack of price stickiness on the sellers' side ($\mu \approx 0$) reduce the size of the segregated region, implying stronger social mixing.

3.4 Discussion on the parameters

Thanks to the analysis performed in this section we understand which parameters are the most relevant to determine the price distribution and the level of segregation in the ABM. First, the price stickiness from the sellers determines whether they would lower the reser-

vation offer price given the previous market price, and so stickiness (i.e. $\mu \ll 0$) implies higher prices and stronger segregation (Eqs. (6) and (9)). Second, the relative weight of the attractiveness in the utility function affects the preferences of the agents towards the most attractive zones (Figure 1b): a value of β close to 1 would likely imply a segregated centre. Third, the demand γ and the income distribution $\{\gamma_k\}$ directly determine the prices through the CDA, and thereby affect the level of segregation.

All other parameters have the same effect of the above or matter marginally: a only matters for technical reasons; K just gives how finely the income distribution is described; if the ratio Δ/Y_1 (which is an effective parameter that combines Δ and Y_1) is large in absolute value (i.e. the income levels are relatively spread), there is slightly more segregation, but the income scale does not matter apart from a multiplicative constant in the price; if σ is chosen reasonably (that is, relatively small compared to n, so that the excess supply plays a significant role in determining the market price) it does not influence qualitatively the behaviour of the model. For what concerns α, it always combines with γ as γ/α (which is another effective parameter). Thus, it would be equivalent to consider high γ or small α. In the same vein, the density of apartments n has an opposite effect than μ, so that more stickiness can be compensated by a higher density of available apartments.

Finally, the attractiveness $A(r)$ and L^2 (or equivalently R_{max}) define the structure and the size of the city. For the choice in Eq. (4), R and R_{max} can be chosen with no loss in generality as a rescaled version of each other. Notice that this is also true with respect to β, as it can be seen from the exponential in Eq. (8): it is equivalent to consider a high β or a small R^2, or vice versa.

4 Numerical simulations

In this section we perform some numerical simulations of the ABM. Now we consider five categories, $K = 5$, and we assume that the agents face a tradeoff between housing and non-housing consumption ($\beta = 0.5$). The other values for the baseline parameters are presented in Table 1. The cost of considering a more realistic setting is that no analytical solution is possible[12]. However, notice that most of the insights gained from the mathematical analysis still hold.

In Section 4.1 we report results concerning the effect of the income distribution on prices and segregation, while in Section 4.2 we analyse the effects of a system of subsidies and taxes.

Symbol	Value	Description
N	100	Number of apartments at each location
L	11	Linear size of the lattice Ω
a	1	Distance between neighbouring locations
R	3	Steepness parameter of the attractiveness
K	5	Number of income categories
Y_1	15	Income of the lowest income category
Δ	5	Difference in income between 2 consecutive categories
β	0.5	Weight given to the attractiveness in the utility function
α	0.1	Probability for housed agents to become sellers
μ, σ	-30,10	Parameters of the reservation offer price
Γ	1210	Total number of incoming agents each time step
Γ_k	$(6-k)\frac{\Gamma}{15}$	Total number of incoming k-agents each time step

Table 1: Model parameters

[12]To ensure full replicability, the code used for the simulations is available upon request to the corresponding author.

4.1 Effect of the income distribution

We study the effect of the income distribution on the segregation pattern. In Fig. 2a the distribution is uniform over the income values (case (a)); in Fig. 2b the distribution decreases linearly from lower to higher incomes (case (b)). Not surprisingly, the segregation is more pronounced when the share of richer agents among the buyers is bigger (for instance, 2-agents are segregated away from the centre in case (a) and not in (b)); also, the average market price is higher in case (a) (see Fig. 2c). Less expected, the income distribution determines the offset of the price distribution, rather than changing substantially its steepness (Fig. 2c). More interestingly, if one considers an additional flux of 5-agents who choose with uniform probability among some of the locations in the very centre, there is of course a substantial increase of the market price in the centre, but also a uniform increment all over the city (as it can be seen from the black line in Fig. 2c). This is due to a "trickle-down effect": the richest agents are less likely to choose a location in the centre because of the higher price, so they have to search elsewhere, and this entails a cascade which influences the price even in the locations farthest from the centre.

4.2 Effects of subsidies and taxes

One of the policies that may be used to reduce income segregation is to apply *ad-valorem* taxes and subsidies on the transaction prices. Let us denote by ξ_k the net tax or subsidy (1 + tax - subsidy) for k-agents. Their budget constraint at the optimal level becomes: $z_k(t) + \xi_k P(r,t) = Y_k$. Replacing the budget constraint in the utility function, we get:

$$U_k(r,t) = (Y_k - \xi_k P(r,t))^{1-\beta} \, (A(r))^{\beta} \tag{10}$$

Also the reservation demand price changes: now $P_k^d = Y_k/\xi_k$. We consider *information entropy*[13] as a quantifier of the level of social mixing: $S(r) = -\sum_{k=1}^{K} \nu_k(r) \log \nu_k(r)$, where $\nu_k(r)$ is the fraction of k-agents at distance r. The information entropy is maximal (minimal) for the highest (lowest) level of social mixing.

The results can be seen in Fig. 3 for all policies. As it can readily be noticed, the biggest difference in terms of social mixing is in the centre, with little effect on the peripheries. We find an interesting result: taxation alone is counterproductive, whereas subsidies are much more efficient. The latter sentence may look counterintuitive from an economic point of view: subsidies are expected to push the demand curve upward, thereby increasing the transaction prices and nullifying the effect of the financial support. In fact, a closer look at the simulations reveals that the increase in the market price is much smaller than the increase in purchasing power that the subsidies entail. On the contrary, taxes only slightly reduce the market price, and 1 and 2-agents still cannot afford purchasing an apartment in the segregated areas. Moreover, only 3-agents benefit from this modest reduction, even worsening the situation for the poorest agents.

5 Conclusion

The goal of this paper was to present a simple Agent-Based Model that explicitly reproduces the price formation mechanism in housing markets and that is specifically suited to study issues related to income segregation. Our model considers a city whose locations are characterized by a certain level of attractiveness. The buyers, heterogeneous in their income, apply to a location by taking into account its attractiveness and the quantity of non-housing goods that they estimate to afford given the price of the apartments at that location. The sellers look at the market price at the previous time step and at the level of excess supply in determining their reservation price. Buyers and sellers are then matched through a continuous double auction.

[13] Other indicators of social mixing could be used, but information entropy has the nice property that it is highly nonlinear for small values in the distribution, so a small percentage of poor agents that makes it to live in the richest neighbourhoods would have a noticeable effect.



(a)



(b)



(c)

Figure 2: Results from the numerical simulations, averaged over 500 time steps after the steady state had been reached. The parameter values are as in Table 1, if not otherwise specified. (*Top*) Average number of k-agents as a function of the distance from the centre; $\Gamma_k = \Gamma/5, \forall k$ (case (a)); $\Gamma_k = (6-k)\frac{\Gamma}{15}$ (case (b)). When the share of the richest agents is bigger, there is substantially more segregation. (*Bottom*) Average market price as a function of the distance from the centre. The additional flux is composed of $\Gamma/5$ 5-agents looking for a location with uniform probability in $E = \{(x, y) \in \mathbb{Z}^2 \text{ s.t. } x^2 + y^2 \leq 4\}$. The prices rise all over the city.



Figure 3: Average information entropy as a function of the distance from the centre. Taxes only: $\{\xi_k\} = \{1, 1, 1, 1.1, 1.2\}$; Taxes + subsidies: $\{\xi_k\} = \{0.8, 0.9, 1, 1.1, 1.2\}$; Subsidies only: $\{\xi_k\} = \{0.8, 0.9, 1, 1, 1\}$. There is a noticeable effect only in the centre, and subsidies are more efficient than taxes in increasing the level of social mixing.

We have presented the mathematical solution of some simplified cases of the model. We have been able to characterize its (stable) steady state and to understand the effect of the parameters. We got a number of expected results in the context of housing markets: a higher demand or a lower supply increase the market price, the importance given by the buyers to the attractiveness of locations determines the gradient of the prices, the price stickiness worsens the level of segregation, whereas a higher number of available apartments has the opposite effect (a well known policy to reduce income segregation is to construct new apartment buildings). Other results are less expected: first, the income distribution of the buyers determines the offset of the spatial price distribution, thereby increasing segregation if the share of rich agents in the distribution is higher. Second, an increase of the demand in the most attractive part of the city can potentially increase the prices all over the city. These two results are in qualitative agreement with the data on the Paris housing market, which come from the B.I.E.N database (see Gauvin et al. (2013) for a more detailed description on the data). As it can be seen in Figure 4, the prices follow the same trend both in the centre and in the periphery. Finally, an unexpected result was that the subsidies are much more efficient than the taxes in mitigating income segregation. The explanation for this seemingly counterintuitive phenomenon is that ad-valorem taxes on the transaction prices only come to the benefit of middle-class agents, whereas the subsidies directly target the poorest agents.

This work can be extended in several directions. First, it would be interesting to estimate the parameters of the model using data on the Paris housing market and to see whether it is capable of reproducing the price distribution and other stylized facts. Second, we did not consider heterogeneous size for the apartments: preliminary simulations have shown that by considering several sizes the segregation may be reduced (e.g. some poor people decide to live in small apartments in the centre, some rich people prefer to live in a big apartment in the periphery), but there are a lot of ambiguities in determining the market mechanism[14]. Third, one could write a reaction-diffusion equation for the attractiveness, so that diffusing hotspots of high price could naturally emerge as a consequence of a small increase in the

[14]Should all apartments be on the same market, or should one consider several markets for each size? When are the total price and when the price per squared meter considered? Which of the two prices do the buyers look at when considering where to apply for an apartment?



Figure 4: Average price per squared meter (in euros) of the real-estate transactions in the Paris housing market as a function of the year. The data are disaggregated per *arrondissement*. The arrondissements from 1 to 11 can be considered as central, while the ones from 12 to 20 are more peripheral. The prices follow the same trend both in the centre and in the periphery.

attractiveness at some location, representing the gentrification mechanisms.

More in general, by assuming heterogeneity, bounded rationality and the potential lack of Walrasian equilibrium we have been able to model the price formation mechanism in housing markets in a realistic and decentralized way. The buyers do not strictly maximise their utility, so there is a demand distribution over the locations. The prices are not set by the market clearing condition, so that excess demand or excess supply, which naturally occur in housing markets, can be observed. Finally, the full heterogeneity in the income of the buyers let us study the drivers of segregation in a more complete way, being able to discriminate between agents of several income categories. This work provides a concrete example of the results that can be obtained if one considers these assumptions jointly and models the market behaviour in a natural way, rather than resorting to more sophisticated and unnecessary assumptions.

Bibliography

Alonso, W. (1964) *Location and land use. Toward a general theory of land rent.*: Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard Univ. Pr.

Bouchaud, J.-P. (2013) "Crises and collective socio-economic phenomena: simple models and challenges," *Journal of Statistical Physics*, Vol. 151, pp. 567–606.

Colander, D. (2006) *Post Walrasian Macroeconomics*: Cambridge University Press.

Feitosa, F. F., Reyes, J., and Zesk, W. (2008) "Spatial Patterns of Residential Segregation: A generative Model.," in *GeoInfo*, pp. 157–162.

Filatova, T., Parker, D., and Van der Veen, A. (2009) "Agent-based urban land markets: agent's pricing behavior, land prices and urban land use change," *Journal of Artificial Societies and Social Simulation*, Vol. 12, p. 3.

Fujita, M. (1989) *Urban economic theory: land use and city size*: Cambridge University Press.

Gauvin, L., Vignes, A., and Nadal, J.-P. (2013) "Modeling urban housing market dynamics: can the socio-spatial segregation preserve some social diversity?" *Journal of Economic Dynamics and Control*, Vol. 37, pp. 1300–1321.

Geanakoplos, J., Axtell, R., Farmer, J. D., Howitt, P., Conlee, B., Goldstein, J., Hendrey, M., Palmer, N. M., and Yang, C.-Y. (2012) "Getting at systemic risk via an agent-based model of the housing market," *The American Economic Review*, Vol. 102, pp. 53–58.

Gilbert, N., Hawksworth, J. C., and Swinney, P. A. (2009) "An Agent-Based Model of the English Housing Market.," in *AAAI Spring Symposium: Technosocial Predictive Analytics*, pp. 30–35.

Landvoigt, T., Piazzesi, M., and Schneider, M. (2015) "The Housing Market(s) of San Diego," *American Economic Review*, Vol. 105, pp. 1371–1407.

Nadal, J.-P., Weisbuch, G., Chenevez, O., and Kirman, A. (1998) "A formal approach to market organization: Choice functions, mean field approximation and maximum entropy principle," in J. Lesourne and A. Orlean eds. *Advances in Self-Organization and Evolutionary Economics*, Paris: Economica, pp. 149–159.

Pangallo, M. (2015) "The housing market as a complex system: may income segregation emerge in cities from microscopic interactions?" Master thesis, Università di Torino.

Ricardo, D. (1817) *Principles of political economy and taxation*: John Murray.

Von Thünen, J. (1826) "Der isolierte Staat," *Beziehung auf Landwirtschaft und Nationalökonomie.*